# REMARKS

## STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-66 were previously pending.

Claims 1, 5, 7-8, 21, 27, 36, 42, 43, 56, 58, have been amended, claim 57 has been cancelled, while no claims have been added. Therefore, claims 1-56 and 58-66 pending and are submitted for reconsideration.


## PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

In the office action, claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,092,194 (hereafter "Touboul") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,202, 207 (hereafter "Donohue"). Claims 5-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Touboul and Donohue in further view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0098883 (hereafter "Pennell"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections, with respect to the pending claims, for at least the following reasons.

**Independent claim 1** recites, *inter alia,* a method of displaying a web page at a client device which includes (1) assessing, at the client device as part of displaying the web page, which of plural trust levels is to be accorded to the object, and (2) wherein assessing which of the plural trust levels is to be accorded to the object evaluates criteria, *as part of displaying the web page,* based on the content, source, or action of the object. These recited features are not disclosed by the applied prior art.

Specifically, the office action relies on Touboul for disclosing these recited features. However, Touboul discloses an Internal Network Security System 110 (on which its security program 255 and security database 240 are located) which is coupled to an Internal Computer Network 115 (on which a client device is located). See Figs 1 and 3 of Touboul. Touboul discloses that "[t]he internal network security system 110 examines Downloadables received from external computer network 105, and prevents Downloadables deemed suspicious from reaching internal computer network 115." See

col. 3, lines 10-14 of Touboul. That is, Touboul does <u>not</u> disclose (and in fact teaches away) from the currently claimed assessing, at the client device as a part of displaying the web page, which of plural trust levels to be accorded to the object based on the content, source, or action of the object.

Neither is this deficiency in Touboul cured by any of the other applied references. Specifically, Pennell relates to a method of checking whether a pop-up window should be displayed but does not relate to which ones of plural trust levels should be accorded to an object displayed at a client device based on the source, content, or actions of the object. Likewise, Donohue relates to a method and a mechanism for synchronized updating of interoperating software and does not cure the deficiencies of Touboul. Accordingly, the office action fails to make a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claim 1.

Furthermore, the applied references do not provide the specific advantages of the claimed features which allow for a more efficient communication of the results of the object analysis to a user on the client device. For example, as recited in claim 7 (discussed further herein), these recited features allow for a modeless prompt to be provided to a user that describes the analyzed object at the client device. Using Touboul's disclosure, a separate network security system would need to communicate back to the client device which would add to the network traffic and also user the response of the user interface on the client device. Therefore, neither the specific recited features nor its advantages is disclosed by the applied references.

The **independent claims 21, 36, and 56** recite a computer storage medium with instructions or an apparatus, respectively, that are also patentable for reasons that are very similar to that discussed above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, these independent claims are also believed to be patentable over the applied prior art.

**DEPENDENT CLAIMS**

The dependent claims are deemed to be patentable at least based on their dependence from allowable independent claims. In addition, they recite patentable subject matter when considered as a <u>whole</u>.

Specifically, **dependent claim 7** recites that <u>a modeless prompt</u> that indicates a <u>suppression of an object</u> **also provides a description of the object being suppressed**. No such disclosure is provided by any of the applied references. Specifically, with respect to modeless prompts, the office action cites to Pennell, paragraph [0081]. However, this disclosure of Pennell only discloses that identified bad windows are blocked and does not disclose anything related to the claimed modeless prompt which also provides a description of the object being suppressed. In fact, even when the blocked windows are hidden from the user's view, the user may simply have an opportunity to review the windows themselves and are not provided any description of the object being suppressed in a modeless prompt. Accordingly, this feature is not disclosed by the applied references and provides an additional reason for the patentability of dependent claim 7.

**Dependent claims 27 and 42** also recite similar features which are also patentable for reasons that are similar to that discussed above with respect to claim 7. Accordingly, these dependent claims 27 and 42 are patentable for these additional reasons.

**CONCLUSION**

   Accordingly, applicants submit that the application is now in condition for allowance and an indication of the same is respectfully requested.   If the Examiner believes that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below.

   *If this Amendment is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time.  If there is a fee occasioned by this Response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.*

Respectfully submitted,

Microsoft Corporation

Date: __August 7, 2007__     By:  __/Aaron C. Chatterjee/____

               Aaron C. Chatterjee
               Reg. No. 41,398
               Attorney for Applicants
               Direct telephone (703) 647-6572
               Microsoft Corporation
               One Microsoft Way
               Redmond WA  98052-6399